

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

A regular meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Michael Christianson at 7:05 p.m., **Wednesday, June 7, 2006**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Michael Christianson, Chair
David Werner, Vice Chair
Mary Lee Rosenbaum
David Varnam
Frank Povero

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Richard Holdaway, City Attorney
Deborah Woldruff, Community Development Director
Rolland Crawford, Fire Marshall
H.P. Kang, Senior Planner
Jeffrey Peterson, Associate Engineer
Allan Peñaflorida, Planning Technician
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

Director Woldruff reported that there were no items to be added or deleted. Chair Christianson stated that he would reorder the items to start the discussion with Item No. 2 followed by Items 1 and 3.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Fred Ramos 26445 First Street, Bryn Mawr addressed the Commission to request that City Staff inspect the houses being built for the Park Lane project on Whittier Avenue at First Street. He stated that he did not think that the builder was constructing the houses to code. Director Woldruff stated that the Building Division used stamped and approved plans when inspecting new construction. After further comments, Mr. Kang stated that he would make an appointment with Mr. Ramos for Monday, June 12, 2006 in the afternoon to inspect the structures that Mr. Ramos suspected of not following the plans.

PC-06-32 - ZONE CHANGE NO. 06-02, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 06-02 (17795), PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN NO. 06-03, and DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 06-01

Senior Planner Kang provided a brief staff report stating that the reason for the request for a continuance was that a further study of the project revealed that a Zone Change was not necessary; however a variance request for side yard setbacks was required.

Chair Christianson commented that he believed that he would need to recuse himself from any discussion on the matter or if public testimony was given because he owned property within the 500 foot radius from the project site.

Chair Christianson opened the public comment period at 7:13 p.m. As there was no one wishing to address the Commission, the public comment period was closed.

Motion by Rosenbaum, seconded by Varnam, and carried by a vote of 4-0 Christianson abstaining to continue the item to the Adjourned Regular meeting of June 28, 2006.

PC-06-33 - PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN NO. 06-02 AND VARIANCE 06-04

Before the discussion began, Vice Chair Werner commented that because of his work relationship with the Loma Linda University Medical Center he would recuse himself from the discussion. City Attorney Holdaway concurred that because Loma Linda University Medical Center was a source of income for Mr. Werner that it would be prudent for him to do so.

Planning Technician Allan Peñaflorida stated that the project was a request to demolish two existing residential structures and an accessory building in order to construct a new 42,000 square-foot, three-story 58-student apartment building with an underground parking garage. He went on to say that the site was located on the north side of Mound Street, west of Shepardson Drive, and was part of an existing Loma Linda University property. He indicated that the variance request was to reduce the front set back requirement from 25 feet to 18 feet to accommodate a larger entry lobby.

Mr. Peñaflorida continued to say that the Historical Commission recommended an approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the two on-site structures and one accessory structure at their meeting of May 1, 2006; however, the Commission also recommended that a working group be formed to work with the applicant and staff to modify the proposed building facades to include architectural elements that were reminiscent of the original College of Medical Evangelists (CME) structures (i.e. pitched roofs, arched window treatments, and associated color schemes). He went on to say that the group met on May 10, 2006 and received a detailed presentation from the Loma Linda University representatives and the architects for the project. Following the presentation, the group expressed their concerns about the building elevations and recommended that the building have architectural tie-ins with historical structures around the project site.

Mr. Peñaflorida stated that his presentation was brief because the applicant and his architect would provide a more detailed PowerPoint presentation of the project.

Chair Christianson opened the public comment period at 7:21 p.m.

Mr. Verlon Strauss, Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs for the Loma Linda University thanked staff for their work and commented on a good working association throughout the whole project.

He stated that approximately two years ago, Loma Linda University Adventist Health Sciences Center (LLUAHSC) had come before the Planning Commission to share their Campus Master Plan. Mr. Strauss stated that at that time, the Foundation had provided 10 major goals and objectives as follows:

- Walking Campus
- Secure Environment
- Establish a "Sense of Place"
- Research Focus
- Institutional Strategic Plan
- "To Make Man Whole"
- Preserve & Improve Open Space
- Enhance Quality of Campus Life
- Functional & Aesthetically Pleasing
- Relationship with the Community

Chair Christianson questioned Mr. Strauss regarding the objective of "Preserve & Improve Open Space" and asked what the University's plans were in this regard. Mr. Strauss explained that the University had pledged to improve the current open space and grassy areas around the four buildings of the campus not to develop new ones.

Mr. Strauss explained that the University's student population was growing and that their goal was to provide the students with affordable housing in a secure environment with the ability to walk to their classes. He added that currently the University was providing housing for only 10% of the students and that the goal was to provide increased housing, at a reasonable cost, to 25% of the students.

Mr. Strauss stated that the Daniells Expansion consisted of housing for up to 58 more students, 31 garaged cars, and a 2,400 square foot Dean's apartment in an attractive atmosphere for the residents. He described the facility as follows:

- Four levels – one level planned for underground parking;
- 38, 589 square feet of living space;
- 12,973 square feet of garage space;
- 31 parking spaces;
- A Dean's apartment;
- On site laundry facility; and,
- A patio area for relaxing.

Mr. Strauss then introduced Mr. Bob Carpenter of Onyx Architects to continue with the presentation.

Bob Carpenter, Principal with Onyx Architects, 16 N. Marengo Rd, # 700 in Pasadena proceeded with the description of the project site providing an aerial picture of the location along with pictures of the existing Daniells Hall student housing and a picture of the structures to be demolished.

Mr. Carpenter distributed colored renderings of the project and provided a PowerPoint presentation describing the site and the project. He stated that the new construction was located east of the existing Daniells Hall, where the structures to be demolished were located. He explained that the Historical Commission, at their May 1, 2006 meeting, had requested a redesign of the front entrance to make it more open. Mr. Carpenter described the differences between the two plans were centered around a broader entry plaza for the main entrance, a porch with a curved roof, and the addition of a curved roof on the left side of the building. He added that the changes that the Historical Commission had requested had been implemented but the Commission had not seen the final design, although they had seen the entrance but not

the curved roof over the entrance. He continued to say that they had seen the staircase differential but not the curved element on the east side of the building. He also stated that they were more accurately demonstrating the landscaping scheme.

Mr. Carpenter indicated that they took the comments of the Historical Commission as suggestions for curved windows, etc., and applied their interpretation of the architectural style that should be a University building in this context.

Mr. Carpenter commented that there were security measures built into the complex with a monitored electronic lock system for the front entrance and the garage entrance. He pointed out that the mechanical and electrical rooms were on the lower level in order to keep the roof clear of any mechanical elements, that there was an elevator in the main lobby and a walkway at the top of the front staircase.

Mr. Carpenter showed the Dean's apartment along the east side of the building, which included a outdoor gathering area where the student could visit with the Dean. He listed the amenities for students such as a patio, a common laundry room, and an outdoor access to the terrace over the garage. He pointed out the flat roof was empty of mechanical elements, i.e. air shafts, etc. He indicated that he had received guidance from the University that the area was being proposed as an historic museum and that the University wanted to maintain a view from the museum over the building to the mountains beyond.

Mr. Carpenter stated that they had added a driveway and an entrance to the garage along the west side of the building with an exit to the stairway.

Mr. Carpenter then introduced the landscape architect to discuss the landscape plans.

Rick Meyer, Troller Meyer Associates, of Glendale, addressed the Commission and explained that they met with the Historical Commission who suggested the California pepper tree, the Italian Cypress, the Paper Bark tree and bougainvilleas. He continued to say that they had discussed the use of palm trees with the Historical Commission explaining that the University had decided against them because of maintenance and liability issues. He added that Commission understood their reasoning and consented to the use of other species.

Mr. Carpenter continued with his presentation showing slides of existing conditions of the site, site plans, grading plan, the entry and parking levels, the second, third and fourth level floor plans, and the roof plan. Mr. Carpenter answered questions by the Planning Commission as the slides were displayed. Mr. Strauss responded to a question by the Chair regarding recreation facilities stating that the existing entertainment area and the weight room at Daniells Hall would be available to the students residing in the new building.

Chair Christianson asked why the architect had disregarded the Historical Commission's request for a pitched roof. Mr. Carpenter replied that he had explained to the Historical Commission that a pitched roof would have made the building taller impeding the view of the historical site and that they concurred.

Commissioner Rosenbaum thanked Mr. Carpenter for his presentation and for providing the booklet with the renderings because the 3-D view of the project was easier to visualize and understand.

Chair Christianson reiterated his wish for the palm trees to be re-used.

Commissioner Povero had a question regarding the number of parking spaces. Mr. Peñaflorida explained that the project met the requirements of one parking space for every two students. Mr. Strauss added that it had been his experience that some parking spaces were never used because they had an international population of students and some of them did not own a car.

Mr. Ramos, 25447 First Street, Bryn Mawr commented that, in his opinion pepper, trees were ugly.

Chair Christianson closed the public comment period at 8:07 p.m.

The following motion was presented to the Chair:

Motion by Varnam, seconded by Rosenbaum, and carried by a vote of 4-0, Werner recused, to recommend to the City Council to Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Approve Precise Plan of Design No. 06-02 and Variance No. 06-04 based on the Findings, and subject to the Conditions of Approval.

Chair Christianson called for a recess at 8:07 p.m. and the meeting resumed at 8:15 p.m.

PC-06-34 - TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 17650 & PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN NO. 06-08

Planning Technician Allan Peñaflorida provided the staff report. He stated that the project was a request to subdivide four existing lots into eight single-family residential lots, demolish two residential structures, and remodel two existing single-family residences. He went on to say that the lots ranged in size from 7,423 square feet to 11,059 square feet and that the proposed residential units ranged in size from 2,000 square feet to 2,300 square feet; with three to four bedrooms and two and one half to three bathrooms each. Mr. Peñaflorida added that the project site was located on the northwest corner of Park Avenue and Curtis Street.

Mr. Peñaflorida explained that on March 27, 2006, the applicants submitted a Precise Plan of Design application for the project to be reviewed concurrently with the Tentative Tract Map application submitted on December 15, 2005. He went on to say that the project was reviewed and deemed complete by the Administrative Review Committee (ARC) on March 28, 2006. He added that, however, additional documents and corrections to the plans were required for analysis, along with a traffic study, and a complete historical resources analysis to evaluate the significance of all resources on the site; the applicant was given until May 10, 2006 to submit the required studies so that the environmental documents could be prepared and project processing could continue. Mr. Peñaflorida stated that the applicant had not submitted any of the technical studies or corrected plans.

Associate Engineer Peterson added that a traffic study had been provided to the Public Works Department. He indicated that the applicant had suggested installing stop signs as a mitigation measure. He added that the City Engineer would not allow this because the line of sight distance issues had not been resolved satisfactorily.

Fire Marshall Rolland Crawford indicated that the applicant had consulted with him and that the space provided for fire apparatus met the Fire Department's standards.

Chair Christianson pointed out that Court Street indicated on the plans was in another part of the City.

Commissioner Varnam asked if the applicants had given any indication that they would be providing the requested information.

Mr. Peñaflorida commented that staff was working against the deadline of the Permit Streamlining Act because the application for the Tentative Tract Map was submitted in December 15, 2005 and the deadline was fast approaching. He added that he had contacted the applicant to request the historical information and that the applicant stated that he had had to change architects, which slowed the project down. However, the May 10, 2006 deadline had passed and the applicant had not provided the necessary information. He continued to say that the applicant was apparently in the process of initiating the request for the historical report. He added that the applicant was aware that the review process for the project would have to begin in order to meet the deadline of the Permit Streamlining Act.

Chair Christianson opened the public comment period at 8:23 p.m.

Richard Wiley, 10878 Pepper Way, Loma Linda commented that the tenants of the residences proposed to be demolished stated that the previous owner had informed them that they would be allowed to stay in the residences; they had not been informed by the new owner that the houses would be demolished. He added they found out about the project when they received the notice of public hearing for the project.

City Attorney Holdaway commented that the City could not get involved in a tenant/landlord dispute because of existing State laws. He added that the City's currently practice was to provide copies of all notices of hearing to the occupants as well as to the property owners of all projects.

Chair Christianson thanked Mr. Wiley for the information and closed the public comment period at 8:26 p.m.

Commissioner Rosenbaum commented that she would prefer to see one-story structures in the area of the North Central Neighborhood to make the project more compatible with the area and stated that this project was completely out of character.

City Attorney Holdaway informed the Planning Commission that if the Commission was considering a motion to deny the project, findings would support a denial of the project under Municipal Code Section 17.30.290.

Chair Christianson asked staff if the applicant was in the audience and found he was not present. A discussion ensued regarding the applicant's disregard of staff's request for information and his absence at the meeting to clarify the situation. Chair Christianson reiterated that the street names had not been labeled appropriately.

Motion by Povero, seconded by Werner, and carried by a vote of 5-0 to deny Tentative Tract Map no. 17650 and Precise Plan of Design No. 06-08 based on the lack of pertinent information about the project site and the potential effects of the project provided in the environmental analysis; in addition to issues stated in ARC committee meeting regarding Public Works issues of sight distance and alignment, the possible adverse effect on the peace, health, safety and general welfare of the area based on the design and the lack of information, the inadequate identification of mitigation measures plus the mislabeling of the street names.

Director Woldruff informed the Planning Commission that the applicant could obtain the information and resubmit his application but not within one calendar year from the date of the denial. A discussion ensued on whether to amend the motion to add that the action was without prejudice. Director Woldruff pointed out that the Planning Commission could make a second motion stating that the denial was without prejudice and Attorney Holdaway concurred that the Commission could make a second, clarifying motion to state their intent. The result of the discussion was that the motion would stand as formulated.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes to be approved.

REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

Vice Chair Werner made a brief presentation with photographs that he took while visiting Portland Oregon during the Christmas holidays.

Chair Christianson commented that a customer had come to his shop and offered to sell a framed aerial photograph of the City of Loma Linda, which Mr. Christianson purchased and was donating to the City.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Director Woldruff thanked him for the gift and stated that she would find an appropriate place for the print.

Director Woldruff reported that the General Plan was on the agenda for the City Council meeting of June 13, 2006 for final action. She stated that the June 2006 version of the draft General Plan Update was available and would be provided to them on a CD, as soon as possible. She added that the General Plan could be adopted at one of three meetings: June 13, 2006, June 27, 2006 or July 18, 2006 as part of Old Business to be finalized before the newly elected councilman was seated and before the reorganization.

Chair Christianson asked if the changes to the Ordinance regarding the number of Planning Commissioners had been tabled or rescinded. Director Woldruff explained that it had been included in the amendment to the Ordinance. She added that it was at the discretion of the City Council whether or not new members were appointed to the Planning Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Minutes approved at the meeting of June 28, 2006.

Administrative Secretary